



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,346	12/28/2001	John de Q. Walker	01-152	1045
24319	7590	04/02/2004	EXAMINER	
LSI LOGIC CORPORATION 1621 BARBER LANE MS: D-106 LEGAL MILPITAS, CA 95035			NADAV, ORI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2811	

DATE MAILED: 04/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/035,346

Applicant(s)

WALKER ET AL.

Examiner

ori nadav

Art Unit

2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5-7 and 11-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3 and 5-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kasahara (4,954,850) or Takemura (5,506,442).

Regarding claim 1, Kasahara teaches in figure 3 and related text a varactor comprising: a diode junction P+/N+; a depletion region (column 3, lines 19-55) adjacent to the diode junction; and a doped region N+ (4) beginning at the diode junction, including the depletion region and having a nonuniform dopant concentration profile that continuously increases with increasing depth of the doped region starting from the diode junction continuing to a peak concentration region;

and wherein the continuously increasing nonuniform dopant concentration profile causes the varactor to have an approximately linear capacitance/voltage response characteristic (see figure 4, curve II).

Regarding claim 1, Takemura teaches in figure 1A and related text a varactor comprising: a diode junction P+/N; a depletion region (column 1, lines 66-67) adjacent to the diode junction; and a doped region N (2) beginning at the diode junction, including the depletion region and having a nonuniform dopant concentration profile that

Art Unit: 2811

continuously increases with increasing depth of the doped region starting from the diode junction continuing to a peak concentration region;

and wherein the continuously increasing nonuniform dopant concentration profile causes the varactor to have an approximately linear capacitance/voltage response characteristic (see figure 1B).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 3 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kasahara (4,954,850) or Takemura (5,506,442).in view of Sze. Regarding claims 3 and 5, Kasahara and Takemura teach substantially the entire claimed structure, as applied to claim 1 above, except stating that the nonuniform dopant concentration profile is defined by an equation $N=Bx\exp(m)$, where N is the dopant concentration, x is the depth of the doped region, B is a concentration constant and m is an exponent that determines the degree of curvature of the dopant profile, wherein m is about 3.

Sze teaches that a nonuniform dopant concentration profile is defined by the equation $N=Bx\exp(m)$, where N is the dopant concentration, x is the depth of the doped region, B

Art Unit: 2811

is a concentration constant and m is an exponent that determines the degree of curvature of the dopant profile, wherein m is greater than zero.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a nonuniform dopant concentration profile defined by the equation $N = Bx^m$, where N is the dopant concentration, x is the depth of the doped region, B is a concentration constant and m is an exponent that determines the degree of curvature of the dopant profile, wherein m is about 3 in Kasahara and Takemura's device, because the above equation is known to define a nonuniform dopant concentration profile, and in order to provide the closest characteristics to those of an ideal varactor, respectively.

Regarding claims 6-7, Kasahara and Takemura do not teach the dopant concentration B . It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a dopant concentration B in the range from about $1E13/cm^3$ to about $1E19/cm^3$, and about $1E16/cm^3$ in Kasahara and Takemura's device, in order to improve the characteristics of the device. Note that differences in concentration or temperature do not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical.

"[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). See also In re Hoeschele, 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809 (CCPA 1969). For more recent cases applying this

Art Unit: 2811

principle, see *Merck & Co. Inc. v. Biocraft Laboratories Inc.*, 874 F.2d 804, 10

USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 493 U.S. 975 (1989), and *In re Kulling*, 897

F.2d 1147, 14 USPQ2d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3 and 5-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2811

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. References C-E are cited as being related to varactors..

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology center (TC) 2800 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to TC 2800 via the TC 2800 Fax center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 4-C23. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 2811 Fax Center number is (703) 308-7722 and 308-7724. The Group 2811 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Group 2811 applications.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or any earlier communication from the Examiner should be directed to *Examiner Nadav* whose telephone number is **(571) 272-1660**. The Examiner is in the Office generally between the hours of 7 AM to 4 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **Technology Center Receptionists** whose telephone number is **308-0956**



O.N.
March 26, 2004

ORI NADAV
PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800